

REMARKS**I. Response to Rejections of Claims 1-13 and 16-36 Under 35 USC § 103**

At page 2-13 of the Office Action, claims 1-13 and 16-36 are rejected under USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over "Fernandez" (US Patent number 6,697,103) in view of the Examiner's "Official Notice". The Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection because Fernandez, when combined with the Examiner's "Official Notice", does not disclose all of the limitations of the Applicant's claimed invention.

More specifically, Fernandez does not disclose, suggest, or mention a method of configuring a user interface that includes "computer-assisted equipment *configuring the user interface* of said computer-assisted equipment", as recited in amended independent claim 1.

Nor does Fernandez disclose, suggest, or mention a method for interacting with a remote computer that includes "said computer-assisted appliance *configuring the user interface* of the computer-assisted appliance", as recited in amended independent claim 10.

Nor does Fernandez disclose, suggest, or mention a method for cooperating with computer-assisted equipment that includes "wherein said service program *configures the user interface* of said computer-assisted equipment", as recited in amended independent claim 24.

Nor does Fernandez disclose, suggest, or mention computer-readable media that having computer-readable instructions thereon which, when executed by a computer, cause the computer to perform a method that includes "said service program *configuring the user interface of said computer-assisted*", as recited in amended independent claim 33.

In Fernandez, an integrated network for monitoring remote objects is disclosed. Fernandez includes a controller 6 (Figure 1) and one or more detectors 3 that couple to continuously to provide digital data stream to the Internet. However, although Fernandez includes "a software browser or functionally equivalent interface coupled thereto for monitoring and analyzing remote or local movement of one or

more objects" (column 1, lines 40-42), Fernandez does not include any teaching that might suggest *configuring* the interface. In fact, the applicant cannot find any teaching in Fernandez that suggests that the interface presented to the user is configurable according to a service program or any other mechanism. Fernandez does mention that "User instructions and/or modifications thereto can be conveyed to target unit 4, for example, to change, select, or adjust particular sensors 44, such as camera focus, zoom, tilt, angle, pan, etc.", but these instructions are used to control the equipment settings *and not the user interface itself*, as required by the Applicant's claims.

At page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner has taken "Official Notice" that is obvious that a remote computer would automatically detect the type of program that is suitable for use with certain hardware equipments. The Applicant is unaware that, at the time the invention was made, such remote computer capability was known and was indeed "obvious". Thus, the Applicant requests that the Examiner produce a reference that shows such material as being "obvious", or else withdraw the rejection.

Further, at page 8, item 15, the Examiner has taken "Official Notice" that it is "obvious" that nowadays, it is common to indicate notice that an appliance is ready to receive a service program. The Applicant is unaware that such a capability was known at the time the invention was made and that such a capability might be "obvious". Thus, the Applicant requests that the Examiner produce a reference that shows such material as being "obvious", or else withdraw the rejection.

In view of the amendments to the claims and arguments above, the Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

II. Response to Rejections of Claims 14-15 Under 35 USC§103

At pages 13-14 of the Office Action, claims 14-15 are rejected under USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over "Fernandez" in view of the Examiner's "Official Notice" and further in view of Murakoshi (US Patent number 6,850,971). The Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection because the combination does not disclose all of the limitations of the Applicant's claimed invention. Further, Fernandez teaches away from Murakoshi.

As previously mentioned hereinabove, Fernandez does not disclose, suggest, or mention a method for interacting with a remote computer that includes "said computer-assisted appliance *configuring the user interface* of the computer-assisted appliance", as recited in amended independent claim 10.

In Murakoshi, a system for processing information which reads address information is disclosed. Murakoshi describes a computer for a reproducing medium that includes reading means for reading identification information from a medium set in the computer for identifying the medium. However, Murakoshi does not disclose, suggest, or mention a method for interacting with a remote computer that includes "said computer-assisted appliance *configuring the user interface* of the computer-assisted appliance", as recited in amended independent claim 10, from which claims 14 and 15 depend.


The rejection is further traversed since Murakoshi teaches away from Fernandez. At column 8, lines 44-67, and at column 9, lines 1-10, Murakoshi teaches the selection of a title of a music file, with the goal of reproducing a music file stored on the medium. In Fernandez, a set of detectors (3) "couple continuously to provide digital data streams to the Internet" (column 5, lines 17-18). Thus, when Fernandez and Murakoshi are combined, the resulting system would seem to operate to the detriment of intended function of Fernandez. If the detectors (3) of Fernandez operate to "continuously provide digital data streams to the Internet" then it seems there would be little Internet bandwidth left to perform music CD copying. It would seem that any additional Internet bandwidth (of Fernandez) would *not* be used for the CD copying operations (of Murakoshi), but would more likely be used to acquire additional data from additional detectors used in the remote monitoring surveillance system of Fernandez.

Accordingly, since the combination of the cited references do not disclose the invention of claim 10, from which claims 14 and 15 depend, and since Murakoshi teaches away from Fernandez, the Applicants request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections to the amended claims and pass the Application onto allowance.

III. Additional Fees:

It is not believed that additional fees are due at this time; however, if any additional fee is required in connection with the filing of this Amendment, please charge the fee to Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully Submitted,
William A. Fischer

By: 
Jeff D. Limon
Agent for the Applicants
Registration Number 45,418

Hewlett-Packard Company
Legal Department
1000 NE Circle Blvd.
Corvallis, OR 97330
Telephone: (541) 715-5979
Fax: (541) 715-8581